



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE EXCLAMATORY INFINITIVE

BY ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

An examination of the text and notes of the standard editions of many of our Latin authors in the passages where the so-called exclamatory infinitive occurs has confirmed the present investigator in the opinion that the force of the construction is often misunderstood. Recent editions of early Latin poets show a somewhat better grasp of its significance, especially those of Terence, the author who uses it with the greatest relative frequency.

The first important study of the construction was made by Kraz more than half a century ago: *Die sogenannte unwillige Frage m. d. Acc. u. Inf.*, Strassburg, 1862. For its time it was a careful and scholarly piece of work, and when G. Müller investigated the same theme, *Ueber die sogenannten unwilligen Fragen*, Görlitz, 1875, he found little else than mere details to correct. Both of these scholars discussed Verg. *Aen.* i. 37: "Mene incepto desistere uictam. . . .!" (note the punctuation) and in my opinion both were correct in pointing out that the standard interpretation of the passage as though the Latin were some such expression as "Egone ut incepto desistam" was wrong. It is with this Vergilian example that the student is generally introduced to the construction, and with its treatment as a question and its translation as "Shall I, vanquished, desist from my purpose?" (an interpretation which by mere accident happens to accord with Juno's action as subsequently related by the poet), a misinterpretation of the construction in general is lodged in the students' minds, from which few of them are ever disillusioned. Editors of Vergil have remained unaffected¹ by the interpretation of Kraz, although this as slightly modified by Müller was accepted by Draeger, *Hist. Synt.* II, 412.

None of these scholars, however, considered in any thorough-going way the origin of the construction or the real force of *-ne* which occurs in about half of its instances. The term *unwillig* is an incomplete description of the construction, since on occasions it can

¹ Cf. Forbiger's note.

express delight, and the term *Frage*, used as a concession to what was believed to be its origin, cannot fail to be somewhat misleading. Then came Warren's brilliant and epoch-making study of the enclitic *-ne* in early Latin (*A.J.P.*, II [1881], 50 f.) with his conclusion that in the exclamatory infinitive and in many other situations the *-ne* might be confirmative. As to whether the affirmative-confirmative *-ne* was of an origin distinct from that of the interrogative-negative-dubitative *-ne*, or whether under certain conditions the former was a remote development from the latter, I shall not at present hazard an opinion, since the decision is not vital to my present investigation. Accordingly, since neither Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 75, nor Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, p. 423, has treated the question in a way that brings out its fundamental characteristics,¹ a full treatment of the construction in poetry from Naevius through Horace, supplemented by examples from prose writers of the same period when they shed additional light on the question, may not be without value. For illustration and comparison I shall cite also the principal instances of its occurrence in Greek.

The exclamatory infinitive expresses emotion; indeed, a better name for it would be the emotional infinitive. The emotion indicated is generally one of displeasure—pain, sorrow, regret, chagrin, pity, disgust, reproach, surprise, indignation, shame or the like (cf. Ramain, *op. cit.*, p. 29)—rarely one of satisfaction or delight. Whether it expresses pain or pleasure must be made clear by the context. In point of development therefore the exclamatory infinitive will be found to be the specialized function of an infinitive clause that expresses the fact producing the emotion. The emotion may be indicated by a

¹ Ramain in *R.Ph.*, XXXIX (1911), 28 f. was altogether too severe in limiting the instances of its occurrence to those passages in which the subject accusative was expressed and in which there occurs a negative or the enclitic *-ne* (which he speaks of definitely as interrogative, evidently not knowing of Warren's investigation), or where the infinitive clause is preceded by an interrogation. This very arbitrary principle of division forced him to disqualify about one-third of a possible total of thirty-two instances I have quoted from Plautus. His theory would disqualify two of the seven instances I have quoted from the Comic and Tragic Fragments, two of the four instances in Vergil, one of the five in Horace, about one-half of an approximate total of sixty in Cicero, and would allow the traditional misstatement to stand that there is only one instance in Livy. His theory suits Terence best, since there only about half a dozen out of a total of forty-three would thus be disqualified, but even here he finds some significant difficulties, e.g., *H.T.* 630, CH.: "o Iuppiter, tantam esse in animo inscitiam!" where according to his own specifications he must consider *o Iuppiter* as the substitute for the preliminary interrogation!

verb—*dolet, pudet, piget, miseret, discrucior, queror, perii, gaudeo, gratiam refert*; or may be implied by an exclamatory phrase—*indignum facinus, flagitium ingens*, or the like; or by an interjection—*ah, uah, uae, heu, hui, ei, edepol*; by a general expression equivalent to any of these, or by the general tone of the context. In many instances where the context lacks a verb of emotion, scholiasts supply it for us, and these will be duly quoted. Sometimes an expression *di immortales* or the like calls the gods to witness the fact producing the emotion.

The emotional infinitive, therefore, expresses a fact or what for dramatic purposes is treated as a fact. The tenses ordinarily employed are the present and perfect, each tense having its full time value.¹ On the rarest occasions even the future may be used (Cic. *ad Att.* v. 20. 7: *at te Romae non fore!* xii. 49. 2: *o tempora, fore cum dubitet Curtius consulatum petere!* Livy iii. 67. 1), sometimes as part of a periphrasis, and the future is looked upon as an inevitable consequence of present facts. The infinitive clause may contain *-ne*, the force of which is seldom if ever interrogative, but confirmative. It having been established that the infinitive clause expresses the fact producing the emotion, the question as to whether the origin of the construction was interrogative or not becomes relatively unimportant. It is the personal opinion of the present investigator that the direct interrogative influence in the formation of this construction has been much overestimated by all the investigators from Kraz to Romain, and this was due largely to the notion that the *-ne* was of direct interrogative force.² But a history of the treatment of the passages containing the construction will probably be found to show the displacement of the sign of interrogation, and this has already been done for Terence.³

¹ The statement of Kraz, *op. cit.*, p. 36, deserves to be quoted: "Ich finde in dem Accus. m. Inf. des Ausrufs den Ausdruck des leidentlichen Affects, welcher durch Geschehenes oder Geschehendes durch Thatsachen oder Zustände erregt wird. Leidentlich nenne ich diesen Affect im Gegensatz zu dem reagirenden, der sich in der *ut*-frage ausspricht. Die Beschränkung auf Wirkliches (oder für wirklich Gehaltenes) ist der Erfahrung entnommen."

² Lane, 2116, holds that the *-ne* was transferred to the infinitive clause from the unexpressed verb. This view seems to me to go against the whole spirit of the construction. See, however, *Trin.* 1017.

³ Editors as a rule are woefully inconsistent both with themselves and with one another in the punctuation used for this construction, as can easily be seen by referring to their texts in most of the passages cited below.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF ORIGIN

EXPRESSIONS OF DISPLEASURE

Ennius, 45 (Cassandra speaking):

mea mater, tui me *miseret*, mei *piget*;
optumam progeniem Priamo peperisti extra me, hoc *dolet*;¹
mene obesse, illos prodesse; me obstaré, illos obsequi!

Warren, *op. cit.*, p. 56, deletes stop after *dolet*.

Terence *H.T.* 749:

Ita me di amabunt ut nunc Menedemi uicem
miseret me: tantum deuenisse ad eum mali,²
 illancine mulierem alere cum illa familia!

And. 868:

o Chremes,

pietatem gnati! nonne te *miseret* mei?
tantum laborem capere ob talem filium!

Plautus *Pseud.* 370:

CAL. ecquid te *pudet*?

BAL. tene amatorem esse inuentum inanem quasi cassam nucem!

For a similar change of speaker see *Pseud.* 201.

Trin. 1017:

St. quid, homo nihili, non *pudet* te? tribusne te poteriis
memoriam esse oblitum!

Cf. *Bacch.* 481 f. and Livy iii. 67. 1.

Terence *Ad.* 610a:

AESCH. *discrucior*³ animi:

hocine de inprouiso mali mihi obici tantum. . . .!

¹ Unemotionalized forms may be seen: Pac. 44:

dolet pigetque magis magisque me conatum hoc nequiquam itiner.

Ter. Ad. 272:

hoc mihi dolet, nos sero rescisse et rem paene in eum locum
redisse.

² To my mind this infinitive clause is as clearly exclamatory as the following one with *-ne*.

³ Unemotionalized forms may be seen in Plaut. *Bacch.* 435:

MN. propter me haec nunc meo sodali dici discrucior miser.

Capt. 600:

Crucior lapidem non habere me.

Mil. 617 f.:

PE. quid id est quod cruciat? cedo.

PL. me tibi istuc ætatis homini facinora puerilia
obicere neque te decora neque tuis uirtutibus;
ea te expetere ex opibus summis mel honoris gratia
mihique amanti ire opitulatum atque ea te facere facinora
quæ istaec ætas fugere facta magis quam sectari solet:
eam pudet me tibi in senecta obicere sollicitudinem.

Plaut. *Poen.* 842:

haec quom hic uideo fieri *crucior*: pretiis emptos maximis
apud nos expeculiatos seruos fieri suis eris!

Terence *Eun.* 360:

perii, numquamne etiam me illam uidisse!

Cf. Plaut. *Bacch.* 627 f., 1090, 1102; Ter. *And.* 244, 688, all cited below.
uix suffero: . . . , *H.T.* 400.

querebar, Horace *Epode* xi. 11; *ah*, *Eun.* 208; *And.* 252 (cf. *Ad.* 329 and Donatus); *uah*, *And.* 688; *Ad.* 38; *ei*, *Epid.* 520; *uae*, *Capt.* 945; *hui*, Cic. *ad Att.* v. 11. 1; *heu*,¹ Verg. *Aen.* v. 615; Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 9. 21. It is to be noted that Cicero here uses the construction in a translation from Soph. *Trach.* which does not contain the construction; *hem*, Cic. *ad Fam.* xiv. 2. 2; *ira incendor*, *Pseud.* 201; *dirumpor dolore*, Cic. *ad Att.* vii. 12. 3; *ergo*, *ad Fam.* viii. 17. 1; *quippe*, *ad Att.* v. 15. 1. For general expressions of emotion see *Capt.* 783; *Amph.* 882; *di boni*, *Eun.* 225; cf. *H.T.* 503, 630; *pro deum atque hominum fidem*, *Curc.* 694; *And.* 716 (after); *facinus indignum*, *Ad.* 447; *Phorm.* 613; cf. *Men.* 1004; *Rud.* 393; *Afran.* 52; *H.T.* 922; *flagitium ingens*, Horace *S.* ii. 4. 82; *sed*, *Eun.* 553; *at*, Cic. *ad Att.* v. 20. 7; cf. the use of ἀλλά and δέ in Greek; *malum quod isti di deaeque omnes duint!* *Phorm.* 976, cf. Arist. *Vesp.* 835, βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας.

EXPRESSIONS OF SATISFACTION

Ter. *Phorm.* 338:

immo enim nemo satis pro merito *gratiam* regi *refert*.
tene asymbolum uenire unctum atque lautum e balineis,
otiosum ab animo, quom ille et cura et sumptu absumitur!

Here line 338 and the *quom*-clause in 340 show clearly that the infinitive expresses satisfaction.

Phormio 883-84:

PHORM. . . . *bene*, ita me di ament, *factum*: *gaudeo*.²
tantam fortunam de inproviso esse his datam!

The fact (1) that this expresses pleasure, (2) that *-ne* is lacking, (3) that the illustrated MSS make no scene-division between 883 and 884 has caused many scholars (e.g., Ramain, *op. cit.*, p. 32; see also Elmer's edition, notes

¹ Cf. *Hec.* 282 f.:

Capt. 995: heu me infelicem, hancine ego uitam parsi perdere!
 ehu, quom ego plus minusque feci quam me aequom fuit!
 quod male feci *crucior*.

Cf. *Bacch.* 483 and note.

² For the unemotionalized form cf. Naev. 15:

Afran. 357: Laetus sum laudari me abs te, pater, a laudato uiro.
 uoluptatem capio maxumam cruciari te tua culpa.

See Madvig, *L.G.*, 397.

and appendix to this passage) to disqualify it as an exclamatory infinitive. In reply it may be noted to (1) that in view of the origin of the construction there is no reason why it should not be used to express pleasure when the context makes it perfectly clear; cf. the Greek instances: Soph. *Phil.* 234-35; Arist. *Ran.* 741. (2) A study of the list of examples shows that *-ne* is unnecessary. (3) Except where the stage was left clear, the scene-divisions mark no break in the action. There was no pause in the action between 883 and 884, and so the question as to whether we make a scene-division between them or not has absolutely no bearing on the status of 884 as an exclamatory infinitive.

Cic. *Tusc.* i. 98 (Plato *Apol.* 41): *id multo iam beatius est. tene, cum ab iis qui se iudicum numero haberi volunt euaseris, ad eos uenire qui uere iudices appellentur . . . conuenireque eos qui iuste et cum fide uixerint!*

Note that both here and *Phorm.* 339 *tene* is generic and refers to the speaker.

Pliny *Epp.* iv. 3. 5 (Pliny is delighted): *hominemne Romanum tam Graece loqui!*

Plaut. *Asin.* 580:

edepol senem Demaenetum lepidum fuisse nobis . . . !

This instance may be regarded as an expansion of the exclamatory accusative (cf. Krüger, § 333, and Demosthenes xxi. 209) which often expresses pleasure.¹ The expressing of the verb here seems to have been made necessary to show its reference to the past. Here may be quoted another interesting example:

Tac. *Dial.* 6. 5: *Quod illud gaudium. . . coire populum et circumfundi coram et accipere adfectum quemcumque orator induerit!*

At times we may see the reverse process to that stated above, that of the reduction of an exclamatory infinitive clause to the simple exclamatory accusative:

Ter. *Ad.* 757:

o Iuppiter,
hancin uitam, hoscin mores, hanc dementia!

Cf. Donatus: ἐλλειπτικῶς omnia utpote *stomachatus* secum loquens. deest enim *esse* aut quid tale.

304: *hocine saeculum!*

Donatus: ἐν ᾗθελ questurus de homini saeculum accusat prius.

379: *haecin flagitia!* not cited by Flickinger in his treatment of the accusative of exclamation in Pl. and Ter., *A.J.P.*, XXIX, 303, probably because of Tyrrell's punctuation.

¹ Cf. *Trin.* 591-92:

di uostram fidem!
edepol re gesta pessume gestam probe . . .

Cic. *Verr.* v. 25. 62: Huncine hominem, hancine impudentiam, iudices, hanc audaciam! *Phil.* x. 3. 7: tantamne patientiam, di boni!

Some of the examples quoted above to illustrate the origin of the exclamatory infinitive were cited by Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, p. 75, and by Bennett, *S.E.L.*, p. 423, and it is with pleasure that I acknowledge herewith my deep obligation to both scholars, even though in some minor matters I must dissent from their views.¹

PLAUTUS

- Amph.* 882: AL. durare nequeo in aedibus: ita me probri stupri dedecoris a uiro argutam meo!
- Asin.* 127: ARG. sicine hoc fit? foras aedibus me eici!
- 226: (CL.) haecine te esse oblitum in ludo qui fuisti tam diu!
- 580: See Illustrations of Origin.
- Aul.* 746: EUC. homo audacissime,
cum istacin te oratione huc ad me adire
ausum, inprudens!
- Bacch.* 152: (LY.) magistron quemquam discipulum minitarier!
- 283: NI. adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem . . . !
- 481: (LY.) *dispuDET:*
quom manum sub uestimenta ad corpus tetulit
Bacchidi,
me praesente, neque pudere quicquam!

Interesting as showing a *cum*-clause co-ordinated with an exclamatory infinitive.

¹ Lindsay's quotation of *Bacch.* 237 and *Asin.* 407 as forms from which the exclamatory infinitive might reasonably be held to have been developed is not felicitous; also his suggestion that *Pers.* 42 may be a syncopated development of *Asin.* 127 is not well made. Furthermore, his classification of *Eun.* 755 as an exclamatory infinitive is founded on misconstruction, it being indirect discourse after *uides*, 754. (Thus we should be obliged to admit also such expressions as *Quantulum enim transisse militum*, Tac. *Agr.* 15.) Also his likening the force of the exclamatory infinitive to that of two subjunctive clauses (one of them a repudiative subjunctive) is positively misleading, and based on an error as old as Zumpt, art. 609, end.

Bennett, who quotes Lindsay with apparent approbation, adds certain examples of his own, suggesting among other things that *Hec.* 532:

(PH.) adeon peruicaci esse animo (te) . . . !

may be a development of such forms as *Hec.* 547:

(MY.) adeon me esse peruicacem censes . . . ?

At first this suggestion seemed very attractive, but on further consideration it has not appealed to me as at all convincing.

The exclamatory infinitive must be sharply distinguished from the repudiative subjunctive and from all forms that are a substitute or a periphrasis for the latter. Accordingly, the exclamatory infinitive must not be regarded as an infinitive clause dependent on verbs like *pator*, *sino*, *spero*, *duco*, *iubeo*, and *oportet* understood, generally in the interrogative; cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 739; *Merc.* 785; *Poen.* 368; *Stich.* 132; *Truc.* 925; Terence *And.* 274-75; *Hec.* 613; Verg. *Aen.* ii. 657; v. 848; ix. 560; x. 668; xii. 643-44.

- 627a: MN. *perii.*
 multa mala mi in pectori nunc acria atque acerba
 eueniunt,
 criminin me habuisse fidem!
- 1090: (NI.) *perii, pudet:* hocine me aetatis ludos bis factum esse
 indigne!
- 1102: (NI.) *perii,* hoc seruom meum non nauci facere esse ausum!
Capt. HE. quanto in pectore hanc rem meo magis uoluto,
 tanto mi aegritudo auctior est in animo:
 783: ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi hodie!
- Capt.* PHILOCR. *uae misero mihi,*
 946: propter meum caput labores homini euenisse
 optumo!
- Cas.* 89: OL. non mihi licere meam rem me solum, ut uolo,
 loqui atque cogitare sine ted arbitro!
- Curc.* 200: (PA.) hocine fieri!
 589: (TH.) sicin mihi esse os oblitum!
 623: (TH.) seruom antestari!
 694: CA. *pro deum atque hominum fidem!*
 hocine pacto indemnatum atque intestatum me
 abripi!
- Epid.* 521: (PE.) ei! sic data esse uerba praesenti palam!
- Men.* (MES.) *o facinus indignum et malum,* Epidamnii ciues erum
 1005: meum hic in pacato oppido luci deripier in uia . . . !
- Mil.* (PE.) meamne hic inuitam hospitam,
 quae heri huc Athenas cum hospite aduenit meo,
 tractatam et ludificatam, ingenuam et liberam!
 490:
 626: (PL.) hancine aetatem exercere <mei> me amoris gratia!
Pers. 42: TO. sicine hoc te mi facere!
- Poen.* 842: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
- Pseud.* 201: CAL. nimis sermone huius *ira incendor.*
 PS. huncine hic hominem pati
 colere iuuentutem Atticam!
 370: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
- Rud.* 394: TR. *o facinus inpudicum,*
 quam liberam esse oporteat seruire postulare!
- Stich.* 765: STI. prostibilest tandem? stantem stanti sauium
 dare amicum amicae!
- Trin.* 1017: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
 1046: ST. nonne hoc publice animum aduorti!
- Truc.* 537: PH. hoccin mihi ob labores tantos tantillum dari!
- Truc.* 933: STRAT. huncine hominem te amplexari tam horridum ac tam
 squalidum!

TERENCE

- Ad.* 38: *MI.* *uah*, quemquamne hominem in animo instituere aut parare quod sit carius quam ipse est sibi!
 237: *SA.* hocine illo dignumst? hocine incipere Aeschinum per oppressionem ut hanc mi eripere postulet!
 274: *AE.* ah, stultitias istaec, non pudor. tam ob paruolam rem paene e patria ——! turpe dictu.

ἀποσιώπησις ἐνφημισμοῦ χάριν, Donatus, who would supply *fugere* or *perire*; the perfect infinitive, however, would have been more exact. See Donatus on 274. 4 and 275. 1-3 (Wessner).

(304: See p. 65.)

- 329: *So.* *ah*,
 me miseram! quid iam credas? aut quoi credas?
 nostrumne Aeschinum,
 nostram uitam omnium ——!

Donatus 330. 3: *ἐλλαπτικῶς* omnia, quia fletus impedit uerba. deest autem 'hoc fecisse' uel tale quid. Cf. also on 329. 3 and 330. 1.

(379: See p. 65.)

- 390: *DE.* haecin fieri!
 407: *SY.* 'Aeschine,
 haecin flagitia facere te, haec te admittere indigna genere nostro!' *Aeschine*,
 447: *HE.* *pro di immortales, facinus indignum*, Geta!
 quid narras? *GE.* sic est factum. *HE.* ex illan familia
 tam inliberale facinus esse ortum!
 563: (*SY.*) non puduisse uerberare hominem senem!
 610a: See "Illustrations of Origin."
 629: *AES.* haec adeo mea culpa fateor fieri. non me hanc rem patri,
 utut erat gesta, indicasse!

(757-58: Cf. p. 65.)

- And.* 244: (*PA.*) quod si fit, *pereo funditus*.
 adeon hominem esse inuenustum aut infelicem quemquam ut ego sum!

Donatus: condicionem humanam *dolet et queritur* natum esse quemquam, qui possit esse tam miser ut ipse est ac per hoc: se.

- 252: (*PA.*) *ah*, tantamne rem tam negligenter agere!
 425: *BY.* nullane in re esse quoiquam homini fidem!
 609: *PA.* seruo fortunae meas me commisisse futtili!
 688: *PA.* *uah, perii*: hoc malum integrascit.
 sicine me atque illam opera tua nunc miseros sollicitari!

716: MY. nilne esse proprium quoquam! di uostram fidem!

Donatus: -ne aduerbium percentantis est. This is one of those rare instances in which D. seems wrong.

868 f.: See under "Illustrations of Origin."

877: (SR.) num facti piget?

uide, num eius color pudoris signum usquam indicat?
adeo inpotenti esse animo ut. . . . !

Eun. 208 f.: PA. ah, rogitare quasi difficile sit!

Donatus 4: . . . subauditur 'te mirum est.' Cf. Donatus on 208. 1-3.

225: PA. di boni, quid hoc malist? adeon homines inmutarier
ex amore ut. . . . !

360: See "Illustrations of Origin."

553: CH. sed neminemne curiosum interuenire nunc mihi
qui me sequatur. . . . !

644: (PY.) hocine tam audax facinus facere esse ausum!

H.T. 401: CL. Syre, uix suffero:
hocine me miserum non licere meo modo ingenium
frui!

Eugraphius, in his paraphrase, supplies 'uehementer ingemisco' on which he makes this infinitive clause dependent.

503: (ME.) di uostram fidem,
ita comparatam esse hominum naturam omnium
. . . . !

Eugraphius first supplies 'satis miror'; then (reading *itane*) proceeds to render it interrogatively.

630: CH. o Iuppiter, tantam esse in animo inscitiam!

749 ff.: See "Illustrations of Origin."

921: ME. tene istuc loqui!

The next two lines might have been expressed as an exclamatory infinitive:

nonne id *flagitium est*, te aliis consilium dare,
foris sapere, tibi non posse te auxiliarier?

H.T. 980: CL. adeon rem rediisse ut. . . . !

1041: CH. non mihi per fallacias adducere ante oculos !

Supply not the tame *scortum puduit* suggested by the editors, but the more expressive *scortum puduisse*.

Hec. 227: (LA.) non te pro his curasse rebus. . . . !

532: (PH.) adeon peruicaci esse animo. . . . !

Cf. Hec. 547 and H.T. 912.

645: (LA.) nosne hoc celatos tam diu!

- Phorm.* 153: AN. adeon rem redisse ut. . . . !
 232: (DE.) nec meum imperium, ac mitto imperium, non similitatem meam
 reuereri saltem! non pudere!

Cf. Donatus, esp. 233, 1. non pudere: hoc absolutum est et nulli adnexum.

338-40: See under "Illustrations of Origin."

- 465: AN. enimvero, Antipho, multimodis cum istoc animo *es uituperandus*:
 itane te hinc abisse et uitam tuam tutandam aliis dedisse!

497: PHAED. adeon ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili. . . . !

499: DO. adeon te esse incogitantem atque inpudentem. . . . !

- 502: PHAED. neque Antipho alia quom occupatus esset sollicitudine
 tum hoc esse mi obiectum malum!

The paraphrase of Donatus is: neque tum *esset* mihi hoc obiectum malum, cum Antipho alia sollicitudine esset occupatus, leui quapiam, non hac de nuptiis quae est grauissima. See also his notes 1-3. Cf. Eugraphius: *uehementer ingemisco* me hoc tempore cogi agitare; quo Antipho in alia sollicitudine occupatus mihi auxilium non potest ferre. The inconsistency of the scholiasts and the widely different interpretations given by the editors make this a doubtful passage, so that there may be something in Ramain's suggestion (*op. cit.*, pp. 30-1) that postulates a lacuna before 502. Otherwise the interpretation of Elmer is least open to objection. "To think that this evil was not thrown in my way . . ." = "O that this evil had been thrown in my way at a time when A. was taken up with a different sort of a care!"

Phorm. 528: AN. sic hunc decipi! (MSS decipis), dependent in a general way on Antipho's utterance in 525:

- non *pudet* uanitatis?
 613: (GE.) *facinus indignum*, Chremes,
 sic circumiri!
 810: CH. itan paruam mihi fidem esse apud te!
 883-84: See under "Illustrations of Origin."
 976: DE. *malum, quod isti di deasque omnes diuint!*
 tantane adfectum quemquam esse hominem audacia!
 non hoc publicitus scelus hinc asportarier
 in solas terras! Cf. *Trin.* 1047.

Gulielmus was wrong in rejecting that very helpful verse, 976. Cf. Arist. *Vesp.* 835.

1042: (NA.) nil pudere!

NOTE.—The following passages claimed by some scholars as exclamatory infinitives I have rejected: Ter. *Eun.* 755¹ (Lindsay); 391 (Price on Cic. *de Am.* 98); *Phorm.* 709–10 (Fleckeisen); *Ad.* 934 (Vallquist); Plaut. *Bacch.* 66 (Bennett) where a careful consideration of the text shows that a repudiative subjunctive *penetrem* is required; *Merc.* 785 (Bennett).

COMIC AND TRAGIC FRAGMENTS

- Naev. 72: quae ego in theatro hic meis probavi plausibus
ea non audere quemquam regem rumpere . . . !
- Enn. 45 f.: quoted under "Illustrations of Origin."
- Caec. 292: tantum bellum suscitare conari aduersarios
contra bellosu genus!
- 16: nihilne, nihil tibi esse quod edim!
- Pac. 40: . . . men seruasse ut essent qui me perderent!
- Cf. the Greek translation given by Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II. 146:
ἐμὲ δὲ καὶ τοῦσδε περισῶσαι τοὺς κτενοῦντάς με;
- Afran. 52: o *dignum facinus*, adulescentes optumas
bene conuenientes, bene concordēs cum uiris
repente uiduas factas spurcitia patris!

Unless *dignum* be ironical, *indignum* should be read.

Trag. Inc. 204: hoc metuere, alterum in metu non ponere!

LUCRETIVUS

- ii. 14: o miseras hominum mentes, o pectora caeca!
.
- 16: nonne uidere
nil aliud sibi naturam latrare. . . . !

Reichenhardt, *Der Infinitiv bei Lucretius*, *Acta Sem. Erl.*, IV, p. 458, may be cited to show how sadly astray many of the special investigators of the infinitive have gone in the treatment of this construction. Quoted by Donatus on Ter. *Phorm.* 232.

VERGIL

- Aen.* i. 37. Iuno aeternum seruans sub pectore uolnus
haec secum: 'Mene incepto desistere uictam
nec posse Italia Teucrorum auertere regem! . . . '

The statement of Servius, 'ne non uacat, significat enim ergo,' while not conclusive, is nevertheless significant (cf. Warren, *op. cit.*, p. 64) against reading this as a question. Donatus (who in his *Interpretationes* comments on this passage with much the same spirit as that with which the Terentian Donatus deals with similar constructions in Terence) says among other

¹ So also Barth, *de Inf. ap. Scaenicos Poetas Lat. Usu*, Berlin, 1882, pp. 9–12.

things: 'Exclusa igitur ab inuentione nocendi, exclusa loco et tempore sic animi sui dolores et gemitus intimis sensibus enumerabat *dolet ergo intentionem suam sine effectu defecisse nec superesse iam nocendi consilium uel tempus.* Interea bonorum est incepta deserere, si tamen aut prece flectantur aut sponte ignoscant. Haec *dolet* utramque se occasionem perdidisse et incidisse quod doleret cum ludibrio scilicet, ut superata discedat.'

o Danaum fortissime gentis

- i. 97: Tydide, mene Iliacis occumbere campis
non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra!
cunctaeque profundum
- v. 615: pontum aspectabant flentes: 'Heu, tot uada fessis
et tantum superesse maris!' uox omnibus una.

Servius notes that many do not make *heu* a part of the quotation, a view which it is hardly necessary for the student of this construction to point out as wrong.

- xi. 269: inuidisse deos, patriis ut redditus aris
. uiderem!

Quoted by Donatus on *Phorm.* 466, but missed by Maixner, *de Infinitivi Usu Vergiliano*.

HORACE

- Ep.* 8. 1: Rogare longo putidam te saeculo
uires quid eneruet meas. . . . !
- Pph. in his paraphrase supplies 'mirum est.'
- Ep.* 11.11: contrane lucrum nil ualere candidum
pauperis ingenium! querebar adplorans tibi.

[Acro]: contra meretriciam cupiditatem quae lucrum captans rivalem praeferebat Horatio, queritur ingenium poetae optimi nihil ualere.

If [Acro] understood the passage, his scholium must be emended as above, so as to put a comma after *Horatio*, rather than before it. Another suggestion would be to alter *Horatio* to *Horatius*.

- S. i. 9. 72: Huncine solem
tam nigrum surrexe mihi!
- S. ii. 4. 83: Neglectis, *flagitium ingens*:
ten lapides uarios lutulenta radere palma
et Tyrias dare circum inluta toralia uestis, !

[Acro]: *magis reprehendendus es si torale habueris sordidum et non bene detersum pauimentum, quam si defuerint tibi pisces et uina optima.*

- ii. 8. 67: tene ut ego accipiar laute, torquerier omni
sollicitudine districtum ne. . . . !

Indebetou, *de Usu Infinitivi Horatiano*, got all the instances.

Senger, *Ueber den Inf. bei Catull, Tibull, Propert, and Trillhaas, Der Inf. bei Ovid*, cite no instances of the construction in their respective authors.

CICERO

Cicero as a user of the construction ranks with Plautus and Terence; indeed, with a total of about sixty passages, exclusive of his Latin quotations, he leads even Terence in the actual number of examples, although his use of it is relatively less frequent. A study of his examples shows him to have used the construction in practically all its varieties of form from those that are most pronounced to those that lie on the borderland between exclamation and statement. He uses *-ne* in less than one-third the possible total, though it is not at all improbable that in some of the remaining instances it may have been lost from all our MS sources, even as part of them have lost it in *Att.* vii. 12. 3. A very favorite form with him is that in which he introduces the construction with a separate exclamatory accusative, which the following infinitive clause defines, e.g., *ad Brut.* i. 17. 4: *O magnam stultitiam timoris, id ipsum quod uerearis ita cauere ut, cum uitare fortasse potueris, ultro arcessas et attrahas!* In my list these have been marked *. This type seems not to have come into vogue until the time of Cicero. It was used also by Matus, *Fam.* xi. 28. 3, and by Lucretius ii. 14 f., but the earliest occurrences of it are found in the Verrines. With this type should be compared the earlier Latin usage of introducing the construction with an exclamatory neuter, *indignum facinus* or the like, and the Greek usage of introducing the construction with an exclamatory genitive.¹

With *-ne*:

Att. v. 11. 1; vii. 12. 3; ix. 6. 4; ix. 13. 8; xi. 23. 3. *Verr.* v. 14*; v. 62* *-ne* in acc. excl.; v. 99; v. 123; *Rosc. Am.* 95; *Rosc. Com.* 4. *Cluent.* 15;* 84; *Phil.* xiv. 14; *Brut.* 219; *de Div.* ii. 30*; *Tusc.* i. 98

Without *-ne* (a few of these are doubtful):

Fam. iii. 10. 7?; iii. 12. 2 Lehmann; (Curius) vii. 29. 1?; (Caelius) viii. 17. 1; xi. 24. 1?; (Matus) xi. 28. 3*; xiv. 1. 1*; xiv. 2. 2.

Att. ii. 6. 2; ii. 13. 1; v. 15. 1; v. 20. 7; vii. 2. 8; ix. 9. 2 doleo; ix. 10. 3; ix. 11. 3?; x. 14. 1*; xii. 5. 1* verb to be supplied; xii. 44. 2; xii. 49. 2; xiii. 22. 4 Tyrrell; xiv. 17. 3 exclam. acc. following; xiv. 19. 1?; xiv. 21. 3; xv. 10?; xv. 20. 1; *ad Brut.* i. 17. 4*.

Verr. i. 76; ii. 78; ii. 151*; iii. 107; iii. 145*; v. 61 (not in form); v. 100; v. 115 indirect.

Phil. iii. 18*; v. 16; x. 8; *Vat.* 16; *Brut.* 266 doleo.

Fin. ii. 29; iv. 76; *Tusc.* ii. 21; *N.D.* i. 107 Mayor.

The above citations show the construction as occurring with the greatest frequency in the *Letters*, especially those to Atticus, and in the *Orations*, especially the Verrines and Philippics, where some of the examples show a literary power and a vehemence unapproachable.

¹The *unequivocal nominative* in similar situations is infrequent and late; cf. Pliny *Pan.* 63: *o praua et inscia uerae maiestatis ambitio, concupiscere honorem quem dedigneris, dedignari quem concupieris . . .*!

LIVY

The traditional statement made, e.g., by Wölfflin, *ALL*, VI, 101, that only once does this construction occur in Livy (ix. 11. 12) was unfortunately accepted by Canter, *The Infinitive Construction in Livy*, p. 86. To this should be added iii. 67. 1, quoted by Lane 2116, *cum pudore summo in conspectum uestrum processi: hoc uos scire, hoc posteris memoriae traditum iri Aequos et Volscos, vix Hernicis modo pares, T. Quinctio quartum consule ad moenia urbis Romae impune armatos uenisse!* A thorough search might discover others.

In the authors treated thus far the use of the construction has with unimportant exceptions, as e.g., Cic. *Verr.* v. 115, been confined to direct discourse. Livy's fondness, however, for indirect quotation has complicated the problem, and so we have to deal with the exclamatory infinitive in indirect discourse. A case in point is found in v. 45. 6: *inde primum miseratio sui, deinde indignitas atque ex ea ira animos cepit: Etruscisne etiam, a quibus bellum Gallicum in se auertissent, ludibrio esse clades suas!* By Canter this was classified as a rhetorical question in indirect discourse. A similar instance occurs in iii. 48. 8. A probable instance in indirect discourse without *-ne* is found in iii. 72. 3. On the other hand, xxvi. 29. 4, quoted by Kühner as an exclamatory infinitive is with greater probability to be taken as an indirect question. See Kraz, *op. cit.* pp. 13, 14.

From authors not previously considered may be cited the following: Cato, *Orat.* 41. 9 Jord. (Bennett is wrong in claiming *ibid.* 41. 5.) Pollio, 57. 3; see *ALL*, VI, 101. Seneca, *Brev. Vit.* 12. 8; *Const. Sap.* 18. 2. Justin. viii. 2. 12; xiv. 5. 7. Pliny *Pan.* 13; 80; 86.

None of these instances however illustrates anything new.

EXCLAMATORY INFINITIVES IN GREEK

(Chronologically arranged)

- Aesch. *Ag.* 1662: ἀλλὰ τοῖσδ' ἐμοὶ ματαίαν γλῶσσαν ᾧδ' ἀπανθίσαι
κακβαλεῖν ἔπη τοιαῦτα δαίμονος πειρωμένους
σώφρονος γνώμης δ' ἁμαρτεῖν τὸν κρατοῦντα
(θ' ὑβρίσαι).*
- Eum.* 840 cf. 872: ἐμὲ παθεῖν τάδε, φεῦ
ἐμὲ παλαιόφρονα, κατὰ τε γῆν οἰκεῖν
ἀπίετον, φεῦ, μύσος.
- Soph. *Aj.* 410: ᾧ δυστάλαινα, τοιάδ' ἄνδρα χρήσιμον
φωνεῖν, ἃ πρόσθεν οὗτος οὐκ ἔτλη ποτ' ἄν.
- Eur. *Alc.* 832: ἀλλὰ σοῦ τὸ μὴ φράσαι
κακοῦ τοσούτου δώμασιν προκειμένον.
- Med.* 1051: ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐμῆς κάκης,
τὸ καὶ προσέσθαι μαλθακοὺς λόγους φρενί.

- Arist. *Nub.* 268: τὸ δὲ μηδὲ κυνὴν οἴκοθεν ἔλθεῖν ἐμὲ τὸν κακοδαίμον' ἔχοντα.
- 818: ἰδοὺ γ' ἰδοὺ, Δί' Ὀλύμπιον · τῆς μωρίας,
τὸ Δία νομίζειν ὄντα τηλικουτονί.
τὸ Valckenaer, τὸν MSS.
- Vesp.* 835: βάλλ' ἐς κόρακας · τοιοντονί τρέφειν κύνα.
- Av.* 5: τὸ δ' ἐμὲ κορώνῃ πειθόμενον τὸν ἄβλιον
ὁδοῦ περιελθεῖν στάδια πλεῖν ἢ δώδεκα.
- 7: τὸ δ' ἐμὲ κολοίφ' πείθομενον τὸν δύσμορον
ἀποσποδῆσαι τοὺς ὄνυχας τῶν δακτύλων.
- Soph. *Phil.* 234: ὦ φίλτατον φώνημα· φεῦ τὸ καὶ λαβεῖν
πρόσφθεγμα τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ.
- Arist. *Ran.* 741: τὸ δὲ μὴ πατάξαι σ' ἐξελεγχθέντ' ἀντικρυς,
ὅτι δοῦλος ὦν ἔφασκες εἶναι δεσπότης.
- Ecc.* 787: τῆς μωρίας,
τὸ μηδὲ περιμείναντα τοὺς ἄλλους ὃ, τι
δράσουσιν εἴτα τηνικαῦτ' ἦδη — :: τί δρᾶν;
:: ἐπαναμένειν, ἔπειτα διατρίβειν ἔτι.
- Plut.* 593: τὸ γὰρ ἀντιλέγειν τολμᾶν ὑμᾶς ὡς οὐ πάντ'
ἔσθ' ἀγάθ' ὑμῖν
διὰ τὴν πενίαν.
- Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 2. 3: τῆς τύχης, τὸ ἐμὲ νῦν κληθέντα δεῦρο τυχεῖν.
- Dem. xxi. 209: ἢ δεηθέντι τῷ τῶν πολλῶν προσσχοίεν ἄλλ' οὐκ εὐθὺς
ἂν εἴποιεν 'τὸν δὲ βάσκανον, τὸν δὲ ὀλεθρον, τοῦτον δὲ ὑβρί-
ζειν ἀναπνέειν δέ · ὃν εἰ τις εἰς ζῆν ἀγαπᾶν δεῖ' ;

See Reiske's *Index Graec.* under δέ, Goodwin's edition and Schaefer's variorum.

For the construction in general see Birklein in Schanz's *Beiträge*, pp. 29—31, 36, 41, 87. See also the Greek translation of Pacuvius 40 in Appian, *Bell. Civ.* ii. 146, cited on p. 71.

The main features of the exclamatory infinitive in Greek as illustrated in the examples quoted above may be summarized as follows: As in Latin, the infinitive clause expresses the fact producing the emotion, and the tenses used, present and aorist, have in each instance their full time value. This construction, like many other infinitive constructions, shows the tendency to assume greater definiteness by taking the article. Otherwise the development is less clearly marked than in Latin, or rather it leaves more to suggestion. The emotion produced is never indicated by a finite verb on which the infinitive

clause depends, as so often is seen in Latin, but by a preliminary exclamatory word or phrase in the nom.-voc. (*Ajax* 410), gen. (*Alc.* 832; *Med.* 1051; *Nub.* 818; *Eccl.* 787; *Cyrop.* ii. 2. 3), acc. (*Dem.* xxi. 209), or by an interjection (*Eum.* 840 [872]; *Phil.* 234), or by an adversative conjunction denoting surprise or opposition (*Ag.* 1662; *Alc.* 832; *Med.* 1051) or by a curse (*Vesp.* 835). Sometimes the emotion is expressed by an adjective within the infinitive clause (*Nub.* 268; *Av.* 5, 7) and sometimes the emotion must be gathered from the general context (*Ran.* 741; *Plut.* 593; *App. Civ.* ii. 146). Two of the instances express pleasure—*Soph. Phil.* 234, where the construction is introduced by ὦ φίλτατον φῶνημα, but in *Ran.* 741 the pleasant surprise must be gathered from the general context. In Greek minuscule MSS the punctuation ; or the equivalent frequently occurs with the construction. This is to be explained (like the instances in Latin with *-ne*) on the hypothesis that an exclamation generally is interrogative in a *psychological* sense only, i.e., in *origin* and in *form*, but not in *effect*.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY